



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY, DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,583	10/06/2000	Mike G. Gyde	H0001641	1855

7590 09/15/2003

Honeywell International Inc
Law Department AB2
P O Box 2245
Morristown, NJ 07962-9806

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

10

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/680,583

Applicant(s)

GYDE ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-7, 12-14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hartel et al (“Hartel”, US 5,454,074).

As per independent claim 1, Hartel teaches a method of window management on a display having a plurality of windows, wherein at least one window of the plurality of windows includes at least one checklist selection frame having a layout and a list of available checklists (checklist 72 and checklist 80 of fig. 4), each of the available checklists having at least one task (task 74 of checklist 72 and task 84 of checklist 80 of fig. 4), said method comprising the steps of:

Receiving a selection for a selected checklist from the list of available checklists (select on *Normal* or *N-Normal* button; fig. 4);

storing the layout of the at least one checklist selection frame from which the selected checklist is selected (col. 9, lines 30-45); and

opening a window containing synoptic information related to said selected checklist (fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Hartel teaches the step of opening a window containing said synoptic information further comprises opening a synoptic frame including a synoptic page (fig. 2; the synoptic window in fig. 2 is also a synoptic frame).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Hartel teaches:

displaying the tasks of selected checklist (task 74 of checklist 72 and task 84 of checklist 80 of fig. 4);

receiving an indication of a selected task from said selected checklist (e.g. selecting on *Before Start* task of task list 74; fig. 4);

displaying in said synoptic frame a synoptic page associated with said selected task (synoptic frame of fig. 2 is changed associated with the selected task from task list 74 in fig. 4).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, according to Hartel's system, repeating said highlighting and synoptic page displaying steps for each task in said checklist is inherent; and Hartel teaches restoring the stored frame layout (col. 9, lines 30-45).

As per claims 5 and 6, which are both dependent on claim 1, according to Hartel's system, window of fig. 2 is a FMS frame and a navigational frame.

As per independent claim 7, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per independent claim 12, it is rejected under the same rationale as claims 1 and 2.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

As per independent claim 14, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 14, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartel in view of Southgate (US 5,561,757).

As per independent claims 8, Hartel teaches a method of window management on a display device for a checklist containing a plurality of tasks, said display device having a first display presented thereon, said first display having a frame layout having a first window therein, said method comprising the steps of:

listing at least on of the plurality of tasks in the checklist on the first display (checklist 72 and checklist 80 of fig. 4);

Art Unit: 2174

receiving a selection for a selected task of the listed at least one task e.g. selecting on *Before Start* task of task list 74; fig. 4;

determining that a synoptic window is associated with said task (synoptic frame of fig. 2 is changed associated with the selected task from task list 74 in fig. 4);

storing the frame layout of the first display in memory (col. 9, lines 30-45);

modified Hartel does not teach reducing the size of the first window. However, Southgate teaches that in col. 3, lines 33-45 and in col. 8, lines 14-27. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Southgate of reducing the size of the first window in Hartel's system since it would fit more windows in the same display area;

displaying the synoptic window associated with said task (synoptic frame of fig. 2 is changed associated with the selected task from task list 74 in fig. 4);

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Hartel teaches:

determining that the end of the checklist has been reached (col. 5, lines 43-47);

determining that a frame layout is stored in memory; and restoring said stored frame layout (col. 9, lines 30-45).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 8, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 8.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Hartel teaches storing the first page layout prior to said second page displaying step (col. 9, lines 30-45).

Art Unit: 2174

5. Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartel in view of Roe (US 6,529,137).

As per claims 15 and 17, which are dependent on claims 14 and 16 respectively, Hartel does not teach displaying synoptic information includes the step of displaying a diagram. Roe discloses that in fig. 5 col. 4, lines 17-39). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Roe of displaying synoptic information includes the step of displaying a diagram in Hartel's system since it would help a user to understand more about the synoptic information.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 6/30/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued the following:

(a) Hartel does not disclose, "storing a layout of a frame on the display from which the checklist function is selected." Hartel's storage is of notes (apparently kept in a database 18/Fig. 1) into an "operational notes file" in preparation for display if selected by pushing Hartel's NOTES button. Thus Hartel's storage relates to content storage and is unrelated to window management.

(b) The information shown in Fig. 2 is not synoptic information, but detailed information relating to specific parts.

(c) Hartel's FIG. 2 does not disclose a window, a frame, or a synoptic page.

Art Unit: 2174

(d) The combination of Hartel and Southgate does not teach or suggest every element of Applicant's amended claim 8.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

(a) Hartel does teaches "storing a layout of a frame on the display from which the checklist function is selected" in col. 9, lines 30-45 by stating "the system displays the first *incomplete* normal checklist when the normal button 48 is activated".

(b) The information shown in Fig. 2 is synoptic information because it is overview information related to the *Normal Checklists* 72 in fig. 5.

(c) Hatel's FIG. 2 is indeed a window, a frame, and a synoptic page.

(d) Southgate does teach reducing the size of the first window (col. 3, lines 33-45 and col. 8, lines 14-27) and Hartel teaches the rest of the limitations in claim 8; therefore, It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Southgate of reducing the size of the first window in Hartel's system since it would fit more windows in the same display area.

Inquiries

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
September 5, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100